

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicants in responding.

5

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 21, 25-27 have been amended to provide further clarification. Claims 5 and 24 have been cancelled. No new matter has been entered.

10

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

15

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2003/0169864 to Lapstun et al. (hereinafter "Lapstun"). Applicants respectfully submit that Lapstun fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

20

Independent Claims 1, 3, and 21, as amended, recite a method and/or apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a transfer of information entered on the first media to the second media, wherein the second media is an online duplicate of the first media.

25

Looking at the cited reference, Lapstun discloses methods and systems for enabling telephones to be controlled through computer systems. Lapstun discloses the use of one or more control interfaces which are capable of being used to interact with a computer system, a sensing device operated by a user, each interface comprising sheet material which has coded data printed on it and which allows it to be used to interact with the system via the sensing device. Through this interaction, data from the control interface can be transmitted to the computer system to effect an operation relating to the functioning of the telephone.

30

Lapstun fails to teach or suggest a transfer of information entered on the first media to the second media, wherein the second media is an online duplicate of the first media. At the paragraph cited in the Office Action, specifically at paragraph [0092],


Lapstun is only concerned with one type of media and teaches at most that netpages are pages printed on ordinary paper, but which work like interactive web pages. There is no teaching or suggestion of a transfer of information entered on the first media to the second media, wherein the second media is an online duplicate of the first media, as claimed in independent Claims 1, 3, and 21, as amended.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3, and 21, as amended, are distinguishable over Lapstun and should be allowed. Claims 2, 4, 6-20, 22, 23, 25-28, dependent directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 3, and 21, respectively, are also distinguishable over Lapstun and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the Claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants consider the claimed invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants earnestly solicit the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicants, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States Patent.

Respectfully Submitted,


Florin Corie

Reg. No. 46,244

Customer No. 22862